

CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 36, NO. 13

February 8, 1943

WHOLE NO. 964

DO THE CLASSICS HAVE A PLACE IN WARTIME EDUCATION? (Bagley)

COMMENT AND CONJECTURE ON SENECA

Seneca's Evidence on the Deaths of Claudius and Narcissus (Pack),

Seneca and Other Tutors of Nero (Kamp); "Seneca" in the Middle Ages (Heller); Post-War Effort in Seneca (Alexander)

REVIEWS

HOUSEHOLDER, Anthology of Greek Prose from the Florilegium

Graecum (White); DUCKWORTH, Complete Roman Drama (Haywood)

ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES



LATIN FOR AMERICANS FIRST BOOK : SECOND BOOK

The new ULLMAN AND HENRY
LATIN FOR HIGH SCHOOLS

—the same sound basic training in the fundamentals that won ULLMAN AND HENRY the position of leadership in high-school Latin;

—in materials that emphasize anew American ideals and their ancient background, and thereby invest Latin study with increased, timely values for boys and girls in our democracy.

Use ULLMAN AND HENRY for a unified, modern Latin program; **Third Latin Book** (Ullman-Henry-White) rounds out the three-year course. With **Latin for Americans, First Book**, use the new Ullman-Smalley workbook, **Progress Tests in Latin**, just published.

MACMILLAN

Dallas	::	Atlanta	::	San Francisco
New York	::	Boston	::	Chicago

CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Published weekly (each Monday) except in weeks in which there is an academic vacation or Armistice Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Easter, or Memorial Day. A volume contains approximately twenty-five issues.

Owner and Publisher: The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of Publication: University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Printed by The Beaver Printing Company, Greenville, Pennsylvania.

James Stinchcomb, Editor, University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

John F. Gummere, Secretary and Treasurer, William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Contributing Editors: Lionel Casson, Jotham Johnson, Eugene W. Miller, Charles T. Murphy, J. C. Plumpe, Bluma L. Trell.

Price, \$2.00 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$2.50. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers: to subscribers 15 cents, to others 25 cents prepaid (otherwise 25 cents and 35 cents). If affidavit to invoice is required, sixty cents must be added to the subscription price.

Entered as second-class matter October 14, 1938, at the post office at Pittsburgh, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925, authorized October 14, 1938.

Volume 36 contains issues dated: October 5, 12, 19, 26; November 2, 16, 30; December 7, 14 (1942); January 11, 18, 25; February 8, 15; March 1, 8, 15, 22, 29; April 5, 12; May 10, 17, 24; June 7 (1943).

COMING ATTRACTIONS

FEBRUARY 19 Saint Louis University

CLASSICAL CLUB OF ST. LOUIS

Speaker: Dean F. W. Shipley, Washington University

Subject: Cicero as Orator

Presiding: Professor William Arndt, Concordia Seminary

MARCH 26-27 Holy Cross College

CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND

President: Goodwin B. Beach, Hartford

Secretary: Professor John W. Spaeth, Wesleyan University

Chairman of Local Committee: Rev. John C. Proctor, Holy Cross College

MARCH 13 Barnard College

NEW YORK CLASSICAL CLUB

DO THE CLASSICS HAVE A PLACE IN WARTIME EDUCATION?

In this paper¹ I would emphasize the significance of Latin as basic in those programs of secondary education that prepare for higher education of the liberal type and for practically every field of professional education with the exception of the technologies that are based almost exclusively on mathematics and the physical sciences, chiefly engineering in its various forms. This conception gives to Latin a place in secondary education that is in some ways analogous to the place of the mother tongue in universal elementary education. The analogy is, of course, imperfect, but I shall attempt to show that it has a sufficient measure of validity to justify the contention that any effort to classify secondary-school Latin as a wartime non-essential is both unwarranted and unwise.

Although it is not necessary with this audience, one should say at the outset that this position does not imply that Latin should be required in all secondary-school programs. Recent and even current condemnations of Latin would often lead the uninformed to believe that the Latin requirement is still well-nigh universal in the American high school, that it has a stranglehold on the secondary curriculum, and that those who denounce it deserve credit not only for rare courage but for unusual perspicacity in discovering that Latin keeps thousands of ambitious boys and girls from the high schools and colleges. As a matter of fact,

as you all know and as the man in the street ought to know by this time, the number of high schools requiring Latin for graduation has, since the turn of the century, diminished almost to the vanishing point.

When I suggest, then, that Latin should be regarded, even in wartime, as an essential secondary-school subject, I refer only to those pupils who are competent to study it and who are either seeking a basic liberal education or looking toward careers in certain professions. I take the position that such pupils should not be discouraged from undertaking the study of Latin nor should opportunities for such study be curtailed, much less denied.

In so far as it assumes Latin to be basic in a truly liberal education, this position requires defense in view of the present tendency to discountenance all forms of liberal education for the duration. Beyond this, to include Latin as a relatively indispensable element in a liberal education under any condition requires a special defense.

At the present moment, the military and naval authorities seem fairly unanimous in regarding a liberal education as a wartime non-essential, at least on the collegiate level. Their view has been indorsed by certain educational leaders and by editorial opinion in the press and in the broadcasts of the radio commentators. Indeed, any disposition on the part of the colleges to urge the importance of a liberal education in the face of the war crisis has been frequently interpreted as a vested-interest effort to keep the colleges in operation in spite of war restrictions that are imposing hardships

¹This paper by the editor of *School and Society* was read at the Autumn Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States at the Hotel New Yorker, New York City, November 28, 1942.

on business in general and on industries that are not engaged in war production. In fact, few leaders in higher education have ventured to defend liberal education under these conditions. Among these few, the most prominent, probably, is President Robert M. Hutchins, who in his address to students entering the University of Chicago September 22 said in part, quoted in *School and Society*, October 3 (291):

We need technology to win the war, but technology will not win it. And technology alone will not establish a just and lasting peace. What will win the war and establish a just and lasting peace are educated citizens. . . . I reject in the strongest terms Mr. McNutt's assertion that non-essential courses must be replaced by subjects of immediate utility in winning the war. The courses which will be of greatest value in winning the war are not those of immediate practical utility but those which will teach you as citizens to think.

Although Dr. Hutchins's position might be regarded as extreme, even by many strong supporters of liberal education, it receives a measure of support from a statement made by Dr. George N. Shuster, president of Hunter College, relative to the announcement that fifty colleges had already closed their doors (*The New York Times*, November 7). Dr. Shuster said at that time:

Now that scores of smaller colleges have closed their doors and that a number of larger ones expect to do so shortly will alarm all who believe that Hitler can win no greater victory than to dry up the sources from which alone the trained citizenry of the United States can be drawn. . . . Just what would that victory be? I think you can find the answer in the fact that the German High Command itself warned its government that higher education of a humanistic as well as a scientific kind must be kept going if Germany was to survive.

If we are reluctant to accept the testimony of the enemy, we can scarcely reject Britain's support of the contention that liberal education is not to be classed as a war non-essential. Regarding the draft deferments of students in attendance at British universities I quote from *Bulletins from Britain*, under date of September 20:

Men students of non-technical subjects are allowed one year's deferment above the calling-up age (recently reduced to eighteen years) provided that they undertake fairly rigorous military training. Science and technical students are given deferment for two or more years, and medical students for five years.

Our war leaders should at least consider the fact that Britain, after three years of the most exacting type of warfare and with manpower needs far greater than ours, still regards liberal education of sufficient significance to grant one year of university study in non-technical subjects to men of the age groups considered by the military authorities as constituting the very best material for the armed forces.

I am willing to rest my case for the defense of liberal education as essential even in wartime on the authoritative opinions and the impressive facts that I have just cited. The evidence may not convince those in whose hands the responsibility for the final decision lies, but

it should be sufficient to give the higher institutions a clear conscience in their efforts to continue to discharge, albeit in a necessarily reduced measure, one of their major functions.

The opposition to all forms of education that do not contribute directly to the war effort now threatens the programs of secondary schools as well as those of the colleges. It is in the secondary schools that the foundations for the advanced forms of liberal education must be laid, particularly through basic training in mathematics and the languages. Fortunately the high schools are not likely now to neglect mathematics. The revelation that candidates for officer training, especially in the Navy, have been woefully deficient in elementary mathematics, and that our war effort has been handicapped by this weakness, has brought home to the high schools the peril that lay in their policy during the past two decades of permitting and sometimes encouraging even competent pupils to avoid the studies that are "exact and exacting." In fact, secondary education is likely for the duration, at least, to emphasize mathematics as never before.

The case is different, however, with the study of Latin, and this is most unfortunate if my contention that an acquaintance with Latin is basic to the higher liberal studies is valid, and if it is granted that the advanced forms of liberal education are not to be classed as war non-essentials. Because of the attitude of contemporary educational theory toward Latin, however, a special defense of the former contention is called for. In brief form, my argument for the defense runs as follows:

On the secondary and higher levels, all forms of liberal education depend upon an expansion and multiplication of meanings or understandings or insights; they depend upon the comprehension of ever broadening relationships and the integration of relationships into consistent wholes. The hypothesis of "emergent evolution," which has offered so clarifying an explanation of certain physical and biological phenomena, is equally clarifying in the fields of mental and social phenomena. New integrations of structural elements exhibit qualities that are not attributes of the elements out of which they are formed. Just as water has properties and qualities that are not the properties and qualities of its component elements, hydrogen and oxygen, so the increasing integration of the relatively simple sensory experiences of mental life gives rise to increasingly comprehensive concepts, meanings, understandings, and insights. These are true "emergents" in the sense that, although they are combinations of simpler and more primitive mental processes, and can, so to speak, be structurally explained in terms of simpler structures, their qualities and functions are *not* to be explained in terms of the qualities and functions of their elements. A serious defect of what was until recently the dominant school of educational psychology and still underlies educational theory was to provide only the latter purely mechanistic explanation of the higher mental processes. It was an oversimplification that has done education no end of harm.

The bearing of all this on the present discussion lies in the fact that the development of mind beyond the

primitive plane depends upon the uniquely human ability to think in *symbolic* terms, in *conceptual* terms. Hence formal education from the outset has had as its first and continuing task the insurance of a meaningful mastery of symbols. The beginnings of the earliest civilizations in Egypt and Mesopotamia were contemporaneous with the development of linguistic and numerical literacy, with the development of written language and of the arts of measurement and computation for which numerical and quantitative symbols are essential. Reading, writing, and the number arts have ever since been the fundamentals of elementary education. The more advanced mastery of verbal and mathematical symbols and their underlying concepts has been the basis of education beyond the elementary level from classical times onward—on the linguistic side, grammar, rhetoric, and logic, and later foreign languages, on the mathematical side, arithmetic and geometry, and later algebra. These fundamental bases of a liberal education have not changed over the centuries, and in all probability will not change as long as the human mind remains what it is.

The place held for so long a time in secondary education by Latin as the language second in importance only to the mother tongue is by no means the result merely of tradition, as so many critics would have us believe. It is due to the fact that in most of the languages of the western world a substantial proportion of the words come from Latin, and consequently that an acquaintance with Latin should presumably enhance one's command of the mother tongue. Even of the 10,000 English words most commonly used in the work of our lower schools, as several investigations have shown, nearly half come from the Latin, and a study reported recently by Carr, Owen, and Schaeffer ("The Sources of English Words," *The Classical Outlook* 19.5 [February, 1942] 45-6) shows that this proportion exceeds half in the second 10,000 most commonly used words. Indubitably the proportion increases in the vocabularies that represent the more highly refined concepts and meanings. Carr's report also quotes Oldfather ("Increasing Importance of a Knowledge of Greek and Latin for the Understanding of English," *Kentucky School Journal*, December, 1940, 37-41) to the effect that, since the days of Shakespeare, the Germanic element in the English language has proportionately decreased, "while the Latin-Greek element represents the 'living end' of English." In no insignificant sense, then, as the report points out, the classical languages are not today "dead" languages, but very much alive. Indeed from the point of view of vocabulary, it is not too much to say that Latin is the "mother tongue of our mother tongue."

I have said that, in view of the close vocabulary relationship of the languages of the western world to Latin, an acquaintance with Latin would *presumably* help one

in the use of the mother tongue. The justification of this assumption, fortunately, does not need to rest on a priori reasoning. Many careful investigations have tested its validity, and while there is some conflicting evidence, the net result is clearly in its favor, as is shown by the admirable summary of the experimental literature by Carr (*Encyclopedia of Educational Research* edited by W. S. Monroe, Macmillan, New York 1941) and by his more recent report of March, 1942 (*CJ* 37:334-50).

It is unnecessary to say that one may study Latin without improving one's English, just as one may study hygiene without improving one's health. But among those competent to undertake Latin and to pursue its study intelligently, these exceptions seem to be rare. It is true, also, that some persons who have been innocent of Latin have succeeded in speaking and writing English not only passing well but with distinguished competence. One of the most sensible commentaries that I have seen on this apparent paradox appears in a contribution by Franklin P. Adams to a recent symposium ("Witnessing for Latin," *School and Society* 56 [1942] 270-3):

Certainly there are good writers in English who never had any Latin, and there is many a Latin shark who can't write simple English. But while the race is not always to the swift, that is where to look. A thousand persons who have had Latin—the more Latin the better, as well as the more interesting—will do better in their lives than a thousand who don't know any Latin.

So far, in my defense of Latin as fundamental to the advanced forms of liberal education I have spoken only of the once assumed and now demonstrated influence of an acquaintance with Latin on one's mastery of a meaningful vocabulary in the mother tongue. This, I contend, is of prime significance because advances to the higher levels of mentality depend absolutely on an ever-increasing mastery of meaningful symbols. This again is not personal opinion. In the development of intelligence tests during the past thirty years, the tests that were found very early to correlate most highly with the combined results of all single tests were those that measured the range and effective use of one's vocabulary. According to present theory, the organic basis of general intelligence is determined by physical heredity. The development of intelligence is determined in part by the physiological maturation of the organism but in part also by appropriate cultural stimulation. Obviously, the forms of stimulation that promote the meaningful mastery of symbols are of primary importance, hence the fundamental significance of language and mathematics in formal education.

There are, of course, other contributions that the study of the classical languages may make to a liberal education, but there is neither time nor need to list these on the present occasion.

I said at the outset that a study of Latin should be regarded as basic in all programs of secondary education

designed for those who look forward either to advanced education of the liberal type or to a career in any of the professional fields except the technologies based on mathematics and the physical sciences. In the technologies based on the biological sciences the case is different, and here ignorance of Latin is a serious drawback. (Parenthetically, it may be added that, except for the classical scholars, few persons, even among the scientists themselves, realize how recently all scientific literature was written and printed in Latin. It was not until the middle of the eighteenth century that chauvinistic pressures within the modern nations compelled science to abandon the convenient and effective Esperanto of Latin and to publish investigations in the respective vernaculars. Small wonder, indeed, that the vocabularies even of contemporary science bristle with the words and the grammatical forms of the Latin.)

While the value of a Latin background in the professions and technologies just referred to is doubtless sufficiently obvious, I am unable to cite extended investigations in substantiation of the inference. There is, however, one profession for which such evidence is available and, curiously enough, this is the profession of teaching, not alone the professional teaching of English and the Romance languages for which a knowledge of Latin is conceded to be well-nigh indispensable, but professional teaching on the elementary and secondary levels in general. I refer to the investigation reported by H. L. Kriner in 1931 (Penn State Studies in Education, No. 1), with the findings of which, I am sure, you are all familiar. Merely for the sake of the record I may say that Kriner compared the efficiency of teachers in elementary and secondary schools, as determined by the judgments of their supervisors, with the subjects that these teachers had taken in high school. Stated in "betting terms," high-school pupils who successfully complete in high school more than two years of Latin have the best chance of succeeding if, later, they become public-school teachers; those who complete more than two years of mathematics rank next; those who complete more than two years of the physical sciences are third; while those who spend more than two years on the social studies are a poor risk.

Kriner's study should be kept in mind particularly because it lends a measure of support to the hypothesis that the study, under the right conditions, of such languages as Latin and Greek may still merit recognition as a mental discipline despite the relegation of the disciplinary theory to the limbo of allegedly invalid assumptions. That the theory prevails, perhaps in a naive form, among some of the military leaders is suggested by the advice given by an army officer at a war conference of the colleges last September. When asked what subjects the colleges should emphasize in courses for prospective soldiers, this officer is said to have replied, "Teach them mathematics and Greek!"

As almost the only professional student of education who has kept an open mind on the question of mental discipline over a period of forty years, I am naturally not disposed to ridicule this suggestion, although I should be disposed to apply it in a more generalized form. Certainly if our war experiences so far are to teach education anything, they should bring into high relief the tragic mistake that American education theory has made in encouraging, whether indirectly or explicitly, the following of the lines of least mental effort. The fact that competent pupils have avoided mathematics and the physical sciences has been a serious handicap to our war effort. It is the part of wisdom not to let the same softening influence still further curtail the study of Latin, for this, if my contentions are valid, is with mathematics the most significant basis for the advanced forms of liberal education, and the problems that now so clearly lie ahead—and in a future that will probably be not so remote as seemed likely a few weeks ago—will require liberally educated leadership as keenly and clearly as the war crisis requires competent technological leadership. Already a primary function of American education is to prepare for the necessarily prolonged period of global reconstruction that will follow what now, with some reason, we may hope will not be a prolonged global war. In the task of reconstruction, our country must obviously play a major part. We recently had good reason not to regret that we had a President who was able to address the people of France in their own language. This is only a very minor earnest of the value that will accrue to our efforts if we can have for the work that lies ahead liberally educated leaders who will be in a position to command respect and confidence throughout the world, as well as to see the problems that confront them in a perspective that only a liberal education can provide. To narrow and curtail the programs of the secondary schools and colleges at the present time would be to adopt a policy comparable only with the isolationist policies that prevented our country twenty years ago from assuming those responsibilities in the League of Nations which, it is generally agreed, might well have prevented the present global tragedy.

The notion that we should not plan for peace until we win the war is, in my judgment, a pernicious species of defeatism. Government and industry and business are legitimately engrossed in the vital problems of the present, but education by its very nature must organize its resources primarily for the future, and when the needs of a not remote future are so clearly predictable as they are today, education would be both cowardly and recreant to its trust if it did not make these needs the very center of its present programs, especially on the secondary level.

WILLIAM C. BAGLEY

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

COMMENT AND CONJECTURE ON SENECA

Seneca's Evidence on the Deaths of Claudius and Narcissus

Of all the witnesses to the death of the emperor Claudius, Seneca is the least informative although he must have been the best informed. His *Apocolocyntosis* betrays several traces of an "official" version which was presumably circulated by Agrippina and differs in two important details from the standard account left us by Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio.¹ In reviewing these discrepancies I shall try to reconstruct this inspired version a little more fully.

The most conspicuous variant relates to the hour at which Claudius died. Seneca takes great pains to place the time at shortly after midday on October 13 (*Apocol.* 2: *inter sextam et septimam* [sc. *horam*]), but Suetonius says that death had come at dawn after a night of suffering and that the fact was concealed until all arrangements could be made for the succession. During the morning, prayers were offered for the emperor's recovery and actors were brought in to cheer his convalescence (Suetonius, *Claud.* 44-5; cf. *Dio* 60.34.2). According to Tacitus, the prayers were offered at a meeting of the senate, while Agrippina detained her stepchildren, closed the palace, and spread the report that her consort was improving—*quo . . . tempus . . . prosperum ex monitis Chaldaeorum adventaret*. Then at noon the palace doors were suddenly thrown open, Burrus and Nero emerged, and the latter's succession followed (Tacitus, *Ann.* 12.68; cf. Suetonius, *Nero* 8). Seneca confirms one detail in Suetonius, the introduction of actors (*Apocol.* 4); he seems to be dwelling humorously on this feature of the plot in order to edify a select group of sophisticates who are acquainted with both the truth and the pretense. As to the motive for the delay, Suetonius' explanation might appear the more satisfactory simply because it is more prosaic: one can easily see that Agrippina was a busy woman on that October morning. Yet the reason given by Tacitus should not be dismissed as altogether fantastic. We know that various omens of some great change had been reported, and that Claudius himself had had premonitions, so that he had refused to appoint consuls designate for any month beyond that in which he actually died (Tacitus, *Ann.* 12.64; Suetonius, *Claud.* 46). In *Apocolocyntosis* 1 Seneca calls III. Idus Octobris the beginning of a *saeculum felicissimum*, and later (3) he says jokingly that the astrologers should sometimes be allowed to tell the truth. It is conceivable, then, that the delayed announcement squared conveniently with certain prophecies as to the precise commencement of the new age.

The second point is whether Claudius died by poisoning or from natural causes. It has been suggested that

since Seneca has *Febris* accompany him on his visit to Olympus (*Apocol.* 6), perhaps the inspired version was that Claudius died of malaria. The familiar story of the mushroom has the weight of all later authorities behind it, so that one would have to champion a paradox if he wished to argue seriously that Seneca alone gives us a hint of the truth. I shall be content with noticing that there were three circumstances which may have conspired to favor the official view. (1) Claudius' death came in the sickly Autumn, a fact underscored by Seneca, though he does not draw the natural inference explicitly. (2) A number of magistrates had died in the preceding months (Tacitus, *Ann.* 12.64; Suetonius, *Claud.* 46; *Dio* 60.35.1), as if the season had brought a high rate of mortality. (3) Claudius had continued to hold court during July and August² instead of withdrawing to some country retreat. That this would have been the reasonable thing to do we gather from *Ep.* 104, where Seneca, advised by his physician that the fever has "laid a hand upon him," escapes to his villa at Nomentum. It is evident from his serious writings that he knew a great deal from personal experience about the symptoms and treatment of malaria,³ and he would have been well able to abet, or at least to appreciate any effort that may have been made to create an atmosphere suggesting death by disease.

One of the plotters was the emperor's personal physician, C. Stertinius Xenophon,⁴ who had spent much money in building a health resort in Naples.⁵ Probably it was he who urged Claudius' secretary, the freedman Narcissus, to take a course of treatment for his gout in Campania (Tacitus, *Ann.* 12.66). So Narcissus left for Sinuessa, and the way was cleared for the designs of Agrippina, which she knew would be seriously hampered if he remained in Rome (*Dio* 60.34.4). Tacitus (*Ann.* 13.1) and *Dio* (60.34.5-6) agree that she caused his death as well, and that it followed that of Claudius. Tacitus speaks of the method in vague terms (*...aspera custodia et necessitate extrema ad mortem agitur...*),

²*Apocol.* 7. Of course this point loses some of its force if we accept Buecheler's emendation of *Tiburi* for *tibi*.

³The best source is *Ep.* 78. For references to the other passages, see the *Index rerum memorabilium* in F. Haase's Teubner edition, svv. *febris*, *quartana*. W. H. S. Jones does not discuss the rôle of *Febris* in the *Apocolocyntosis*, nor does he give much attention to Seneca's evidence on malaria generally, in either of his interesting studies: *Malaria, A Neglected Factor in the History of Greece and Rome*, Cambridge 1907; *Malaria and Greek History*, Manchester 1909. Of course Claudius had always been handicapped physically. A study by T. DeC. Ruth concludes that he suffered from a "paraplegic rigidity" of prenatal origin (*The Problem of Claudius*, Johns Hopkins dissertation 1916).

⁴R. Herzog has written a detailed biography of Xenophon (*Historische Zeitschrift* 125 [1922], 216-47), based largely on inscriptions from his homeland of Cos.

⁵Pliny, *H. N.* 29.7. For Claudius' sojourn there, cf. *Dio* 60.6.

¹See A. P. Ball's commentary, New York 1902, 17, 162, 179.

and allows the reader to suppose that the scene was Sinuessa, but Dio relates that he was executed near the tomb of Valeria Messalina. Seneca has him take a shortcut and reach the entrance to Hades, that is, the Tarentum in the Campus Martius, in advance of his master. He still shows the effect of his treatment (... nitidus, ut erat a balineo ...), and when Mercury bids him go ahead to announce their arrival he does so quickly—*quamvis podagricus esset* ... (Apocol. 13). The geography is consistent. Narcissus had been brought from Sinuessa along the Via Appia as far as the tombs of the Valerii; there he had been slain, and his spirit had hurried down the Sacred Way and along the Via Tecta to the Tarentum, the route a part of which was traveled by Claudius himself. In Apocolocyntosis 1 Seneca says that the Curator Viae Appiae is the best witness to Claudius' deification because he saw Augustus and later Tiberius move along that road to glory (cf. Suetonius, Aug. 97-100, Tib. 72-5). This joke would have more point if Claudius, too, had journeyed heavenward along the Appian Way, but apparently he died in Rome, and the best known occasion on which he had traveled the famous road was when he had marched in from Bovillae in the cortege of Augustus (Suetonius, Claud. 6). But this was indeed the last journey of Narcissus, so Seneca's clear hostility to Livius Geminus, the curator, may reflect some encounter the plotters had with him along the highway under his care. Further, a third detail of the plot may underlie the passage in which Seneca seems to represent Narcissus as having died before Claudius, or rather before the supposed time of Claudius' death. For Narcissus' known devotion to his patron suggests another likely motive for dissembling the hour of Claudius' passing: it might have been risky to allow the news to be circulated before Agrippina was sure that her archenemy had also been put to death. Perhaps Dio's evidence is in point here (60.34-5): when Narcissus knew he was to die, he burned a number of Claudius' secret documents, and since he must have done this chiefly to protect the emperor himself,⁶ it seems he did not realize that his precautions were a little too tardy to be of use.

ROGER A. PACK

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Seneca and the Other Tutors of Nero

Lucius Annaeus Seneca was not the only man responsible for the teaching of young Nero. Yet in popular literature and even in much that has scholarly circulation it is always Seneca who is charged with influencing that emperor. Nero had at least four other

tutors. Seneca himself was instrumental in obtaining some of them.

According to Tacitus (Ann. 14.3) and Suetonius (Nero 35.2), Anicetus was evidently a teacher of Nero even before Seneca was appointed tutor.¹

Suidas (vol. 1, p. 203, ed. Bernhardt) states that Alexander Aegaeus, a Peripatetic philosopher, was a teacher of the emperor Nero, and that he was assisted by Chaeremon the philosopher.²

Another teacher is mentioned by Josephus (A.J. 20.8.9). His name Beryllus, or Burrus, has been confused with Afranius Burrus, the co-worker with Seneca in his most influential days under Nero. The identity has never been settled.³

H. W. KAMP

HENDRIX COLLEGE

"Seneca" in the Middle Ages

In an interesting note in CLASSICAL WEEKLY 35 (1941-2) 257, Dr. Barlow has reviewed the history of the treatise *De Quattuor Virtutibus Cardinalibus*, ascribed to Seneca in many manuscripts and early printed editions, but really derived from a work by St. Martin of Braga or Bracara (Martinus Dumiensis, *Formula vitae honestae*). Because of the great number of manuscripts containing it, and because the treatise was widely quoted in the Middle Ages and early renaissance, Barlow called this Seneca's most popular work. I should like to propose another candidate for this somewhat dubious distinction, a work which has even less claim to be considered genuine, but which was rather more frequently quoted. Moreover, since most of the quotations made from it by Chaucer and others as if from Seneca turn out on inspection to be really from Publilius Syrus, an explanation of this circumstance should not be unwelcome.

As Bickel argued, the material in Bishop Martin's treatise was probably drawn from the lost *De officiis* of Seneca. Other brief compilations of material possibly drawn from the works of Seneca (and usually ascribed to him in manuscriptss) circulated in the Middle Ages as convenient handbooks for ethical instruction. One such is *De remediis fortuitorum*, a series of epigrammatic retorts to speakers complaining of various misfortunes, which suggested to Petrarch the title and some of the matter in his essay teaching men how to bear good fortune as well as bad (*De remediis utriusque fortunae*). Another is *De paupertate*, a collection of excerpts from the *Epistulae* of Seneca bearing on this

¹Cf. Hohl, "Domitius," Pauly-Wissowa Suppl. 3.352-3.

²See Pauly-Wissowa 3.2026 and Reitzenstein, *Humanität in Altertum*, Strassburg 1907, 17 and 30.

³The arguments on both sides are well presented by Henze, "Beryllus," Pauly-Wissowa, and by Katterfeld, "Beryllus-Burrus," Berl. Phil. Woch. 33 (1913), 59.

⁶Contrasting with this the later instance of Petronius, who actually sent the incriminating evidence to his oppressor (Tacitus, Ann. 16.19).

topic. A third, which can be traced in several forms far back through the Middle Ages, is best known as *Liber de moribus* (edited in Wölfflin, *Publilius Syri Sententiae*, Leipzig 1869, 136ff.). Petrarch ascribed this work too to Martin and this ascription was current in the sixteenth century, but there is no evidence to support it. It is a collection of apothegms, pointed and sententious observations on human conduct. Some of the maxims probably stem from Seneca. One, for example, is "Quid est dare beneficium? imitari deum" (Wölfflin 47), obviously a paraphrase by some Christian of Seneca, *De beneficiis* 3.15.4: "qui dat beneficia deos imitatur." It is possible that Seneca's lost works were the source for others of these sententiae, but the authenticity of the collection as a whole is dubious. Nevertheless, it was ascribed to Seneca in the manuscripts, and sentences from it were often quoted as Seneca's. Moreover, from this collection sententiae were drawn, at some point before the tenth century, to complete, under the letters *N* to *Z*, a truncated copy of an alphabetical collection of somewhat similar epigrams culled long before from mimes of Publilius Syrus. The new amalgam somehow received the title *Senecae Proverbia* or *Senecae Sententiae*. It is this collection, existing in a great many manuscripts and early printed editions, which I think may challenge the claim of *De quattuor virtutibus* to be called Seneca's most popular work in the Middle Ages.

Vincent of Beauvais in his great encyclopaedia quoted about half of the four hundred-odd sentences of this collection, some more than once, though usually he did not name the author. At about the same time Albertanus of Brescia quoted, in the course of several didactic works which proved to be very popular, some 69 verses from this collection, naming Seneca as the author if he named anyone. Chaucer, who is known to have used Albertanus, names Seneca more often than any other classical author, save Ovid, and most of his quotations prove to be sententiae from the *Proverbia*, i. e., *Publilius*.¹ These facts are well known. I can add some data derived from an investigation of the quotations from Seneca in certain Spanish novels of the sixteenth century.² In these novels, the famous *Celestina* (1499) and its continuations, "Seneca" is quoted some twenty times (more than three dozen times, if we include some unacknowledged quotations in *Celestina*). Of these quotations, all but a few are referable to the *Proverbia*, a Spanish translation of which appeared repeatedly between 1491 and 1552. While some of the quotations from the *Proverbia* cite sentences which come from the

Liber de moribus, and thus have some claim to be considered Senecan, most of them are really from Publilius. The authors of these semi-dramatic novels of Spanish life gloried in the reputation of their countryman, "el moral Seneca" (cf. Dante, *Paradiso* 4.141), but they seem to have been more responsive to the somewhat cynical worldly wisdom expressed by the characters in the Roman mimes.

Petrarch had his doubts of the authenticity of the *Proverbia*, but Erasmus, in his London edition of 1514, was the first to distinguish formally between the two portions of the collection and to restore the name *Publius* (i. e., *Publilius*)³ to the first part. Reasons for the persistence of the error through the six preceding centuries are not hard to find. Seneca sometimes quoted *Publilius* in his epistles with approval, even admiration (e.g., Ep. 8.8-9; 94.28). Two of the verses he cited were the first two in the collection of *Proverbia*. Seneca often aimed at a pointed and sententious style, like that of *Publilius* in these maxims. And sometimes Seneca gave form to thoughts readily associated with those of the comic dramatist. For example, the author of *Celestina* (1.175 ed. Cejador y Frauca [Madrid 1913]) quoted in successive clauses, without naming his source, a sentence from the *Liber de moribus* and another from *Publilius*. Finally, we may note that the confusion has persisted even in modern times when some editors have tried to recast the prose sentences of the *Liber de moribus* in the iambic verse of *Publilius*. Thus the influence of the mediaeval fusion of these two sources of the extremely popular *Senecae Proverbia* has not ceased to operate.

J. L. HELLER

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Post-War Effort in Seneca

Despite the grimness of the times for intellectual pursuits and the transfer of so many of our younger scholars from libraries and seminar rooms to the ruder activities of the camp and the battlefield, we must assume that the great classical tradition is to be carried on among us here in America after the world conflict is ended; if it is not, we shall know definitely who lost the war. With its conclusion many who have had to suspend their scholarly activities and some others who, by reason of extreme youth when the war broke out, are just then attaining graduate status will be wondering in what part of the classical domain to preempt a locus standi. I should like to suggest that from several

¹H. M. Ayres, *Chaucer and Seneca*, *Romanic Review* 10 (1919) 1-15, especially 3.

²I have to thank my colleague, Professor R. L. Grismer of the Department of Modern Languages, for permission to mention this investigation, the results of which we hope to publish in full elsewhere.

³Meyer, *Publilius Syri Mimi Sententiae*, Leipzig 1880, 14. The true form of the dramatist's name as found in the best manuscripts of other classical authors who cited it was not established until after the appearance of Wölfflin's article in *Philologus* 22 (1865) 439.

points of view Seneca presents a field still fairly wide open, and to express the hope that it may enlist the energies of some at least of the younger generation of classicists.

I intend to speak more particularly of his prose, but I am bound to point out that his dramas also offer an attractive range of effort. The whole offering of Seneca in the field of drama needs to be carefully restudied and reevaluated in its relation to the feeling of the age in which it was written, and must not be simply disparaged in an offhand way as compared with the products of Greek tragedy; there is much more that is original in Seneca's plays than sniffy Sophocleans can be brought about to admit. Shakespeare, quite a competent dramatist, is in some respects nearer Seneca than he is to Sophocles. There is also the interesting question of the relation of Seneca's whole vocabulary and manner of speech in the plays to that employed in the Letters and the various Moral Essays. Reverting however to his prose works, I shall again narrow my range in the present note and refer more specifically to the constitution of the text, a problem which has interested me for some years now.

The text of Seneca's prose is far from being satisfactorily established despite the wide reading he has been accorded at various times and the strong affection shown for him in some particular countries, and also despite the efforts of some of the greatest classical scholars from Renaissance times down. This is not, except in the Natural Questions, a difficulty depending very seriously on the filiation of manuscripts; it arises rather from the bulk of his prose work, which would be a great task for any one scholar to cover adequately in a lifetime, and from its intrinsic nature as a most striking part of the rhetorical efflorescence of Silver Latin. Yet both of these things, while obstacles, are also clues.

It is a great boon to be able to check an author's style and vocabulary from himself; in prose, Cicero, Livy and Seneca afford us this opportunity. The student who selects Seneca's prose as his life-work must master the 1500 or so Teubner pages of available material until the style, vocabulary and syntax of the writer become so much a part of his experience and indeed of himself that he can say with much assurance "This is Seneca" and "This cannot be Seneca." There is not much use in quoting the usage of other authors, especially authors of the strictly classical period, to check Seneca when Seneca himself has left us so rich a field out of which to extract corroboration or rejection for a given point of view. Any young man who proposes to gain the mastery to which reference has been made should begin at the first opportunity; life will barely be long enough, if indeed it does suffice. And, of course, to speak with full competence of Seneca's prose means in the best sense a sound acquaintance with

Seneca's dramas, when we reflect that Silver Latin very definitely lowered the bars between prose and poetry. Of course, the fine index of Seneca's dramatic vocabulary already in our hands places us all under an immense obligation to Professor Oldfather and his associates in this respect, and that obligation will be greatly augmented when their index to his prose Latinity appears; we trust that present circumstances will not cause undue postponement. And yet no index, however worthy and complete, can ever replace a knowledge acquired by "lesen, viel lesen, sehr viel lesen."

The other great point I would wish to emphasize is that anyone selecting Seneca's prose as a field of scholarly operations on the textual side should come into it with the feeling that probably, except in some obviously loci desperati, the text is reasonably sound. The more he studies it, the more he is likely to be first surprised and afterwards amused by the jugglings exhibited by such eminent Latinists as, for example, Madvig. My own experience (a growing experience) with passage after passage is that one must in the end be satisfied to let the text as transmitted to us tell its own story. One must approach the text, as far as human beings can, without prejudice or preconception; we must let the Latin speak to us at first without our rashly breaking in with some idea of our own. I am convinced that one important phase of Seneca's rhetorical art is a most disarming simplicity, in appearance, that is, and that a "point" is often scored by something that is seemingly so ingenuous that the great critics, one after another, have walked right into the trap. The structure of Seneca's prose is often as disarming in its apparent simplicity as are the seemingly straight lines of modernist architecture, but its meaning will be revealed only to him who sits down before it in patience and considers often, it must be said, without much regard for the time which that patience demands. If one consecrates himself to a particular task, he must be understood to be consecrating all the time and all the patience necessary for the achievement of the task, and must not be discouraged if the "publishable" material that emerges is small, or at least appears so, and if his effort seems simply in many cases to maintain what is and provides no brilliant chance to guess what isn't.

What has been said already about vocabulary applies equally to end-rhythm in sentences and the major clauses of sentences and also to syntax. Of the former I shall say nothing; as to the latter, the volume of Seneca's prose is so large that he can be made the court of reference and appeal for his own usage. Here again let me remind the prospective investigator that it is of little value as a usual thing to quote Ciceronian passages to prove or disprove a point in Senecan syntax. Dr. B. L. Charney, after making some researches in brachylogies in Senecan syntax, which he himself de-

clared to be only peripheral to the vast subject, was able to demonstrate the fallacy of numerous emendations based on the supposed demands of syntax by appealing to Seneca's actual usage as reported in the best manuscripts. There seems to be every reason to suppose that this could be pretty uniformly demonstrated to be true on further investigation.

In an age when research in the classical field has pushed into the remotest and most dubiously related ranges of effort, and has also often occupied itself with the most inconspicuous and unprofitable authors, it should be emphasized that study devoted to Seneca is eminently worth while in an intrinsic sense. He is a writer of refinement and distinction, a past master in

the handling of the Latin language in the fashion then approved, and yet at times, especially in the perorations of several of the Dialogues, he writes with perfect ease in the great Ciceronian manner. The study of Seneca is not only worth while in itself, but it leads on into a wider acquaintance with Silver Latin generally, a period of the profoundest interest from almost any point of view. It should be needless to add that a comprehension of Silver Latin as a mode or vogue implies, of course, a sound knowledge of classical Latin; one must know the norm to appreciate the divergence.

WILLIAM HARDY ALEXANDER

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

REVIEWS

Anthology of Greek Prose. Reproduced from the Teubner Florilegium Graecum collectum a Philologi Afranis. By F. W. HOUSEHOLDER. 54 pages, photolithographed. Privately printed by author at Columbia University, New York 1942 \$0.90

This is a collection of forty-five separate passages taken from the Teubner Florilegium and designed to provide sufficient material for a semester's reading in a class that meets three times a week. The format is of 8½ by 11 inches in size and each page contains approximately 120 lines of Greek. It is suggested in the preface that if the passages are used for supplementary or sight reading, there is enough material to last two years. The author adds that, aside from condensing some of the passages and arranging them in a different order, he has left them as they appeared in the original Florilegium.¹

There is nothing externally interesting in this solid reading material. Instead of putting titles to the various selections in the body of the text, the author has made a certain appeal to student interest by placing such titles in the Table of Contents. Examples of these are "The superiority of democracy" by Isocrates, "The nature of democracy" by Plato, "Dictators and democracies are natural enemies" by Demosthenes. Other topics that appeal to the student's interest are "Street Brawls in Athens" by Lycias (and Demosthenes), "The injustice of punishing children for the sins of their fathers" by Plutarch, and "And untaught slave-boy proves a theorem of geometry" by Plato. Other authors than those mentioned above are Lucian, Xenophon,

Arrian, Andocides, Athenaeus, Dio Chrysostom, Polybius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Thucydides, Aristotle, Theophrastus, and Pausanias.

It seems to this reviewer that the author has used good judgment in the choice of his selections. There is no question about the appeal of these selections to the student's interest or the timeliness of the subject matter. For example, there is the story of the warrior Er (Plato, Republic) who, after being dead for ten days on the battlefield, came to life on the funeral pyre and told what he had seen in the other world. Readers of Vergil's Sixth Aeneid and of Dante's Inferno would appreciate this. Another selection from Plato (there are ten in all) tells what constitutes the good life and what the bad life. In the passage from Isocrates' Areopagiticus the reader is told that a well-ordered democracy is superior to any oligarchy. The Lacedaemonians are praised because they are the most democratic of all peoples. They select their magistrates on the basis of equity and equality, principles, the writer says, of which the Spartans are most fond.

There is no commentary connected with these selections. The author suggests that it "be supplied by the instructor—which is as it should be."

DORRANCE S. WHITE

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

The Complete Roman Drama. All the extant comedies of Plautus and Terence, and the tragedies of Seneca, in a variety of translations, edited, and with an introduction. By GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH. xlvii, 905; 971 pages. Random House, New York 1942 \$6

In one sense this is a work of popularization and, if one takes an austere view of scholarship, not properly to be reviewed in a classical journal. All the extant Roman tragedies and comedies are translated with the

¹To very inexperienced Greek teachers it may be explained that the original Teubner Florilegium was collected by eleven German scholars who acquired the name "Philologi Afrani." It was their purpose to provide material suitable as sight passages for examinations. The basis of their choice of materials was that it should be rarely read, should be most interesting, and should not be beyond the ability of the average student of college Greek.

indispensable minimum of annotation. There is an introduction to each play and a general introduction. Such being the make-up of the work, one might be tempted to regard it as useful only for students in other fields—English, for example—and containing nothing profitable for the classicist.

It is profitable for the classicist, however. Duckworth's sound scholarship, good sense, and power of exposition, combined with the chance that at this time certain facts about Plautus and Seneca need to be proclaimed loudly and clearly, make the general and special introductions worth while for us who are professionals in the field. Further, his choice of translations provides perhaps unintentionally a first-class text for a teacher who wishes to discuss the theory of translation.

F. J. Miller's manner in translating Seneca is more or less inevitable, and the manner of Terence is fairly easily reproduced in English, but Plautus is far more difficult to translate. For me the reading of the translations by Sugden and Allison was a dreary chore. The familiar manner of our grandfathers is not our manner, so why should we pretend to find it satisfactory? For modern readers of Plautus we should have translations in modern English, although Livy or Cicero might be a different matter altogether. Conversely, the contemporary translators of the other plays must not be discouraged at the thought that some day their grandchildren will see their work and muse fondly on what a quaint old coot Gramp was. That generation must do the job over in its own manner.

The translations made by Duckworth and his collaborators also furnish material for this kind of study. One can hardly say that they have classifiable differences in attitude, except that Weist and Hyde's *Menaechmi* is perhaps the most consistently racy in tone and most daring. The process of checking any of the modern translations against the original, since all were done with thought and skill, will stimulate the mind to consideration of the minutiae which make or break a translation of Plautus.

Perhaps Plautine specialists will disagree with some of Duckworth's judgments on Plautus. Duckworth is no mean expert in this field himself, however, and we may assume that he has good reasons for his opinions. He has done especially well in describing the laughing technique. It is always a temptation to speak with a certain condescension of the belly-laugh. Duckworth very sensibly recognizes that Plautus intended to furnish robust amusement and resists the temptation to use the pejorative tone which for instance Norwood uses in comparing Plautus with Terence. Terence is undoubtedly more highbrow, but anyone who is collecting "possessions forever," whether as texts for his library or as experiences, would be very foolish not to include a few gems of riotous lowbrow fun.

The many minor matters to which the mind of the novice should be directed are adequately treated. The general history of Roman drama is briefly but carefully sketched, with a judicious description of the question of the dramatic *satura*. Stage properties and stage conventions are elucidated. Such matters as Plautus' handling of minor characters and Terence's handling of plot are briefly referred to, so that the beginner may have hints to help him in reading the plays.

Duckworth's estimate of Seneca is refreshing in its candor and judiciousness. He has not contented himself with offering the traditional judgments. It is a relief to read a description of Seneca's work which can speak of his faults and weaknesses and rank him properly below the great triad of Greece, yet not indulge in the game of scoring points off him by pouncing on and magnifying all his faults. Senecan criticism has devoted too much attention to showing why his plays are inferior to those of the Greeks and too little to considering what the plays are like in themselves.

Duckworth has resisted the temptation to ascribe more than due importance to Seneca's rhetoric. Too many critics have been so bemused with Seneca's excessive use of rhetorical devices that they have neglected to consider what the language is about, and have merely belabored a secondary aspect of the plays without contributing anything to our understanding of them.

In almost every generation some scholar has attempted to direct attention to the task of describing the plays as they are. In spite of their excessive use of rhetorical devices, and whether they are suitable for staging or not, they are well worth study as examples of dramatic art. Perhaps some day it will be recognized that the only sound critical procedure is to attempt to give a full description of the plays in all their aspects. Their relation to their models, their excellence compared to that of their models, their diction, their metre, their topical allusions, their choruses, their characterization, their dramatic economy—all should be considered. A great deal of careful and competent work has been done. Unfortunately, however, these discussions are often vitiated, if they attempt to consider more than minutiae, by the intrusion of an emotion which to me is inexplicable. It leads the critic to center his attention on proving Seneca's inferiority to the Greeks. That has been sufficiently proved, and why should it arouse emotion anyway? What we need is dispassionate criticism such as Pratt's study of foreshadowing and suspense which will increase our knowledge of Seneca's purposes and methods. Duckworth deserves well of his readers for having given a sane and well-balanced account of Seneca's plays.

RICHARD M. HAYWOOD

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

This department is conducted by Dr. Charles T. Murphy of Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey. Correspondence concerning abstracts may be addressed to him.

Microfilm or photostat copies of articles abstracted may be obtained through Bibliofilm Service, Department of Agriculture Library, Washington, D. C. The charge for a microfilm copy of any periodical article, regardless of length, is 50c; film copying from books and serials is at the rate of 50c for each 50 pages or fraction thereof. Photostat charges are 10c per page, with a minimum charge of 50c for each item. The Service reserves the right to except material readily available elsewhere.

ANCIENT AUTHORS

Aristotle. FRANZ DIRLMEIER. **ΚΑΘΑΡΣΙΣ ΠΑΘΗΜΑΤΩΝ.** The purpose of the article is to determine whether Aristotle in defining tragedy as a purification of emotions used the word "emotions" as a subjective genitive, an objective genitive or a genitive of separation. By comparison with Aristotle's *Politics* (VI 6 1341a 21ff.) and a half-forgotten piece of evidence from the second book of Theophrastus' *Περὶ μουσικῆς* (frg. 89, Wimmer, quoted in the *Hypomnema* of Porphyrius on the *Harmony* of Ptolemaeus) it is concluded that Aristotle's definition involves a genitive of separation. Tragedy, through the excitement of sympathy and fear, effects the purification or freeing of the soul from these and other emotions.
H 75 (1940) 81-92

(Kirk)

— PAUL WILPERT. *Reste Verlorener Aristoteles-schriften bei Alexander von Aphrodisias.* Alexander confines himself to the text in his comments and bases his conclusions directly upon the text. He endeavors to show what Aristotle could have meant, not to decree what he must have meant or should have said. Where the text seems clear enough, Alexander passes on with a brief comment. Wilpert takes up the writings *Περὶ τῶν Πυθαγορείων*, *Περὶ τάχαθου*, *Περὶ ἰδεῶν* and *Περὶ φιλοσοφίας*, of which he prints the text at the end of the article. In a concluding section on "Alexander's Reliability" Wilpert points out that Alexander writes his quotations not from memory, but with the source right before him. For lost writings we may therefore trust Alexander to give us a true picture of the thought and in many details the exact words of Aristotle.
H 75 (1940) 369-96

(Kirk)

Anaximander. KARL DEICHGRÄBER. *Anaximander von Milet.* The few verbal citations from Anaximander and all the so-called testimonies go back to Theophrastus, and only the statement that Apollodorus saw a writing of Anaximander is independent of the doxographical tradition. The basic fragment, found in Simplicius, *Physics* 24,13, is defended against the charge that the terminology is Peripatetic and hence reveals the hand of Theophrastus. Anaximander's philosophy is summarized in terms of an endless material which contains on the one hand all individual things undifferentiated and on the other hand the world of birth and death which supports the law of justice and a definite order of time.
H 75 (1940) 10-9

(Kirk)

Heliodorus. M. H. A. L. H. VAN DER VALK. *Remarques sur la date des Éthiopiennes d'Héliodore.* The church historian Socrates identifies the author of the romance as having been bishop of Tricca, Thessaly. On this evidence it was assumed that the author wrote under Theodosius or his sons. Discrediting the testimony of Socrates, E. Rohde placed the *Aethiopica* in the reign of Aurelian, Münscher in the time of Septimius Severus. Van der Valk would vindicate the historian by pointing out two passages in the ninth book that are strikingly

similar to descriptions by Julian the Apostate regarding remarkable military tactics employed in the siege of Nisibis, 350, and the use of a certain type of cavalry in the battle of Mursa, 351. The Heliodorus mentioned by Socrates must have composed the romance soon after 351.

Mn 9 (1940) 97-100

(Plumpe)

Orphica. OTTO KERN. *Das Prooimion des Orphischen Hymnenbuchs.* A peculiarity of the poem is that Dionysus does not hold in it the position which is due him as chief god of the Orphic *τελεταί*. It is also striking that the poem, which is dedicated to Musaeus, makes no reference to the Eleusinian divinities. The poet of the poem appears to have written a hymn to *πάντες θεοί*. There is, in fact, in verse 30 a confused conglomeration of genuine and spurious divinities. The poem, therefore, is very loosely connected with the Orphic Book of Hymns and is of different authorship. Back of it lies an unidentifiable book of prayers. This prayer-book, indeed, is the redaction apparently of a Stoic and contains a few additional hymns which were not sung in the worship of a god.

H 75 (1940) 20-6

(Kirk)

Ovid. LUDOLF MALTEN. *Motivgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Sagensgeschichte. II. Noch Einmal Philemon und Baucis.* This is the continuation of an earlier article (*Hermes* 74, [1939] 176ff.) on the legend of Philemon and Baucis. Ovid's account and the description in the Acts of the Apostles (XIV 8ff.) of a native Phrygian belief in a theophany of Zeus and Hermes are strikingly supported by some inscriptions recently published from that region of Phrygia. The flood in Ovid's tale resulted from the overflow of a lake, and near Sedasa is Trogitis Lake which, fed by an underground river, suffers extreme variations of level. Ovid might have learned of this natural phenomenon and the native legends of the theophany from the Roman campaign conducted in that region by Quirinius between approximately 12 and 6 B.C.

H 75 (1940) 168-76

(Kirk)

Philostratus. ALBIN LESKY. *Bildwerk und Deutung bei Philostrat und Homer.* For a century a fruitless controversy has raged over the genuineness of the pictures described by Philostratus. The picture is merely the framework which Philostratus employs to display his learnedness and wealth of fancy—in short his *σοφία*. Bold innovations in the interpretation of pictures are found to be typical of Philostratus because he views the scene rhetorically as the raw material for the creations of his own imagination. This is not only a trick of rhetoric, but it reflects also the typically Greek habit of connecting logos and work of art. The truth of this assertion is considered proven by the existence of this connection in Homer, the fountainhead of all Greek literature. A case in point is the famous Shield of Achilles, suggested doubtless by actual shields which the poet had seen. Elements in the Homeric description which could not possibly be represented in pictorial form make it obvious that the poet is not referring to any particular scene, yet surviving sculptural groupings closely parallel scenes included in the Shield. Therefore it is concluded that the poet has given meaning and hence life to scenes which he had seen in art by building around them a story of which the painter never thought. From Homer to Philostratus that free play of the logos with the work of art typifies the Greek feeling for the unity of all life.

H 75 (1940) 38-53

(Kirk)